

**Capital Projects Advisory Review Board**  
**October 13, 2005**

**Design Industry**

The Design Industry recognizes the design and construction process must respond to changing circumstances in the construction industry. Alternative delivery methods should be considered and evaluated when appropriate for public-sector clients. The appropriateness must be based, in part, on the level of knowledge the client has about the process under consideration and the ability of the client to independently evaluate and manage the process. Any delivery system needs to address assignment of responsibilities, including responsibility for professional liability. Determination to use any delivery system should be based on evidence that the system provides good value.

We recommend that consideration be given to allowing public entities more freedom to reject a contractor who is a low bidder, where that contractor has a history of being unreliable or substandard in the past. We support the use of standardized critiques of performance of architects and contractors following any major capital improvement or construction project with the critiques being utilized in a system used to pre-qualify contractors and subcontractors as part of publicly bid projects, and to continue including performance as a criteria for selecting design professionals under RCW 39.80.

Issues that we would like to see as a focus of discussion for the Capital Projects Advisory Review Board:

- Discussion of qualifications (Owner and Design Team) as a key part of the process
- Discussion and clarification of architect's role
- Administration of the process (for example, establish common/consistent contracts)
- Clarification of the selection process to assure that it is transparent (fair)
- Tracking and monitoring of results in terms of cost/highest value